R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 011 990 AC 000 450

A SENSITIVITY TRAINING IMPACT MODEL--SOME FIRST (AND SECOND) THOUGHTS ON THE EVALUATION OF SENSITIVITY TRAINING. EXPLORATIONS IN HUMAN RELATIONS TRAINING AND RESEARCH, NUMBER 3.

BY- MASSARIK, FRED
NATIONAL TRAINING LABS., WASHINGTON, D.C.

PUB DATE 65

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.09 HC-$2.12 53P.

DESCRIPTORS- *PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS, *SENSITIVITY TRAINING, *MODELS, *RESEARCH METHODOLOGY, INTERPERSONAL COMPETENCE, ATTITUDES, RESEARCH NEEDS, BEHAVIOR CHANGE, PERSONAL GROWTH, EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCE, SELF CONCEPT, TRAINING OBJECTIVES, EVALUATION TECHNIQUES, RESEARCH TOOLS, GROUP DYNAMICS, SELECTION, INTERACTION, INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIP, PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS, CULTURAL ENVIRONMENT, GROWTH PATTERNS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, SENSITIVITY TRAINING IMPACT MODEL (STIM)

THE AUTHOR STATES THAT SENSITIVITY TRAINING HAS BECOME A WIDELY USED AND DISCUSSED TRAINING METHOD, BUT THERE HAS BEEN LITTLE UNITY IN RESEARCH APPROACH. THE PURPOSE OF THIS PAPER IS TO DEVELOP A COMPREHENSIVE FRAMEWORK THAT MAY ORDER EXISTING SENSITIVITY TRAINING RESEARCH AND GUIDE FUTURE RESEARCH EFFORTS, USING THE SENSITIVITY TRAINING IMPACT MODEL (STIM). THIS MODEL CONSIDERS THREE SETS OF HUMAN CHANGE THROUGH TIME--PRETRAINING, TRAINING, AND POST-TRAINING EXPERIENCE. STIM FOLLOWS THE INITIAL TOTAL POPULATION, PRESELECTING POTENTIAL PARTICIPANTS, THE SELECTION FUNNEL THROUGH WHICH SOME OF THEM MOVE BEFORE BECOMING READY TO TAKE PART IN THE PROGRAM, AND THE INTAKE PROCESS LEADING TO FINAL SELECTION. BOTH FOR TRAINEES AND TRAINERS, KEY PSYCHOLOGICAL AND SOCIAL VARIABLES TO BE CONSIDERED IN RESEARCH ARE CLASSIFIED IN TERMS OF AN INTERPERSONAL MATRIX AND AN INTRAPERSONAL MATRIX. MEASUREMENTS OF BOTH MATRIXES PROVIDE MEASURE OF TRAINING OUTCOME FOR INDIVIDUALS AND FOR LARGER SOCIAL ENTITIES, SUCH AS ORGANIZATIONAL, FAMILY, AND FRIENDSHIP RELATIONSHIP PATTERNS. A GRAPHIC VERSION OF STIM AND EXTENSIVE REFERENCES AND FOOTNOTES ARE INCLUDED. THIS DOCUMENT IS ALSO AVAILABLE FROM NATIONAL TRAINING LABORATORIES, 1201 SIXTEENTH STREET, N.W., WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036, FOR $2.00. (SM)

ED011990

Explorations

A SENSITIVITY TRAINING IMPACT MODEL: SOME FIRST (& SECOND) THOUGHTS ON THE EVALUATION OF SENSITIVITY TRAINING

AC 000 450 E

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

EXPLORATIONS IN HUMAN RELATIONS TRAINING AND RESEARCH

Number Three - 1965

A Sensitivity Training Impact Model: Some First (& Second) Thoughts on the Evaluation of Sensitivity Training

by

Fred Massarik

NATIONAL TRAINING LABORATORIES, NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

1201 Sixteenth Street, N. W. Washington, D. C. 20036

Single Copy - $2.00

A SENSITIVITY TRAINING IMPACT MODEL:

SOME FIRST (& SECOND) THOUGHTS ON THE EVALUATION OF SENSITIVITY TRAINING

Fred Massarik[1]

"I don't ever again want to see people 'stripped' of their defenses...sitting there in their bare egos...it was destructive and terrible..."

"I hate to say this...but as I look back, it seems like it was pretty much a waste of time..."

"I don't know...I think I got something out of it...but I just can't put my finger on it...I'm not sure I know what it did for me..."

"It's the greatest thing that ever happened to me..."

****

Sensitivity training has not ceased to be a subject of controversy. The stand of its critics is explicit and vociferous, and its adherents too, are emphatic in their advocacy. Quotations as those above -- paraphrased comments of training group members -- suggest the range of emotional reaction to the experience from the "inside" out. And in the outside world, confrontations among adversaries such as Odiorne and Argyris, have proved to be laden with deep feeling, no less than with intellectual concern for the issues at hand.[2]

---

[1] I want to say a warm "thanks" to my many colleagues and friends who have read drafts of this manuscript at its varying stages of array and disarray, especially to James V. Clark, Joan Lasko, W. H. McWhinney, Warren Schmidt, Arthur Shedlin, Robert Tannenbaum (all of UCLA), and A. T. Polin (USC). On various other occasions I have received helpful comments from Walt Berg, Saul Eisen, Mary Fuller, John Glass, Ken Bobele, Peter Raynolds, and Charles Seashore (NTL). Jerry Reisel proved an effective editor, who ultimately succeeded in getting me to complete this manuscript. However, as I reflect on it now I think he occasionally wielded his cudgel a bit too gently and permissively.

[2] Business Week, March 16, 1963, pp. 160-162, and unpublished papers presented at Cornell conference on management development: George S. Odiorne, "The Trouble with Sensitivity Training," and Chris Argyris, "In Defense of Laboratory Education." (Both papers mimeographed, National Training Laboratories, April 18, 1963.)

If the controversy may be regarded as the leaven of growth, then indeed the appropriate balance of feeling and intellectual involvement in the dispute may be indication that the subject is viable and important; yet sheer polemic resolves little. Ultimately, the confrontation must be based on an expanded volume of rigorous knowledge, drawing on experimental and other empirical study of the sensitivity training process and of its outcomes. Progress in this direction has been made by research-oriented staff in National Training Laboratories settings, in the Western Training Laboratory, and in any number of programs employing T-Group and related methods.[3]

While the body of relevant research -- both imaginative and routine -- has been growing of late, the picture of "the whole elephant" has been slow to emerge. This has not been because of lassitude on the part of the researchers; rather it is due to the fact that the very subject matter resembles a live, multi-faceted mastodon which refuses to hold still for very long.

---

[3] For bibliographies and summaries of laboratory training research, see Lewis E. Durham and Jack R. Gibb (Eds.), Bibliography of Research, National Training Laboratories, 1947-1960. Washington, D.C.: National Training Laboratories, n.d.: Leland P. Bradford, (Ed.), Explorations in Human Relations Training: An Assessment of Experience, 1947-1953. Washington, D.C.: National Training Laboratories, 1954. Pp. 65-78; and Dorothy Stock, "A Survey of Research on T-Groups," Leland P. Bradford, Jack R. Gibb, and Kenneth Benne (Eds.), in T-Group Theory and Laboratory Method: Innovation in Re-education. New York: Wiley, 1964. Pp. 395-441.

Yet one can readily concur with Matthew B. Miles, ("Human Relations Training: Current Status," in Issues in Human Relations Training, Irving R. Weschler and Edgar H. Schein, (Eds.). Washington, D.C.: National Training Laboratories, 1962. P. 9), as he notes that "research in human relations training has had an interesting and uneven history," (ital. mine). Miles (op. cit., P. 11) further notes -- and I agree -- that "...there still is a good deal of room for straightforward evaluation research..."and that "...without such inquiry, one feels a danger that the early 'cultist' enthusiasm of human relations trainers in the U.S.A. will be repeated unreflectively elsewhere."

It is the purpose of this paper to develop a schema specifying the variables that must be considered if we are to arrive at a picture of this whole creature of sensitivity training process and impact. The intent here is not substantive, but programmatic. I will not seek to demonstrate whether sensitivity training is "worthwhile" or even whether it has "impact" on those who are exposed to it.[4] Rather, I will attempt to delineate a conceptual model which may assist in ordering existing studies and may suggest future comprehensive approaches to the investigation of training process and to the assessment of training impact.[5]

A graphic version of this model as a research guide and data-organizing device[6] appears as Diagram I. First, let us consider briefly its general character; later we will return to a more detailed review of its components.

The proposed Sensitivity Training Impact Model, STIM, is one of a family of similar models devised, or devisable, for the study of human change through time. As such, its general parameters are similar to those appropriate to the

---

[4]...though I admit that I have some pretty definite hunches on this issue.

[5]In a brief unpublished manuscript, "Note on Laboratory Training Research" (dittoed, 4 pp., February 1963), Douglas R. Bunker proposes a model for training research, concentrating on three major areas of study: (a) participant focus, (b) trainer focus, and (c) program focus, and including a number of sub-topics, and their interrelationships. Work on the present paper was begun independently of that of Bunker, but I believe that the schema here proposed is somewhat more comprehensive. The two approaches certainly are related and compatible. I like very much Bunker's suggestion that "[various linkages among variables] could be systematically examined under a program of research by either a single research group or by individual researchers within a network of relationships which would permit integrated planning, frequent exchanges of theoretical and methodological learnings, and the accumulative pooling of findings."

After completion of the final draft of this paper, while typing was in progress, I had an opportunity to see Edgar H. Schein's and Warren G. Bennis' chapter "Research on Laboratory Training Outcomes." All three of us very much agree.

[6]Abraham Kaplan's charming discussion of the basic functions of models comes to mind; particularly see pp. 268-69. The Conduct of Inquiry: Methodology for Behavioral Science. San Francisco: Chandler, 1964.

study of group psychotherapy and group counseling. Parameters not predicated on the operation of a group larger than a dyad likewise apply in the study of effects of individual psychotherapy, psychiatric casework, and individual counseling. Studies of teaching impact also find analogues within the framework of this schema.[7]

---

[7]The following are illustrative of approaches to evaluative research in areas related to sensitivity training, especially in psychotherapy, mental health, and other "helping" disciplines. Especially see: S. Bernard Wortis, Morris Herman, and Clarence C. Hare (Ed. Com.), Psychiatric Treatment. Baltimore: The Williams and Wilkins Company, 1953. Joseph Zubin, "Design for the Evaluation of Therapy." Pp. 10 ff; Carl R. Rogers, "A Research Program in Client-Centered Therapy. Pp. 106 ff; Jerome D. Frank, "Areas of Research in Group Psychotherapy." Pp. 119 ff; George E. Gardner, "Evaluation of Therapeutic Results in Child Guidance Programs." Pp. 131 ff; and Hans-Lukas Teuber and Edwin Powers, "Evaluating Therapy in a Delinquency Prevention Program." Pp. 138 ff; Carl R. Rogers and Rosalind F. Dymond (Eds.), Psychotherapy and Personality Change. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954, particularly chapter 1, "Introduction" (Carl R. Rogers, pp. 3-11); chapter 2, "Developing a Program of Research in Psychotherapy" (Thomas Gordon, Donald L. Grummon, Carl R. Rogers, and Julius Seeman, pp. 12-34, including an excellent bibliography); and "Design, Procedures, and Subjects for the First Block" (Donald L. Grummon, pp. 35-52);-Eli A. Rubinstein and Morris B. Parloff (Eds.), Research in Psychotherapy. Washington, D. C.: American Psychological Association, 1959, especially Lewis L. Robbins and Robert S. Wallenstein, "The Research Strategy and Tactics of the Psychotherapy Research Project of the Menninger Foundation and the Problem of Controls," pp. 27-43, and the editors' concluding chapter, "Research Problems in Psychotherapy" (pp. 276-293; Hans H. Strupp and Lester Luborsky (Eds.), Research in Psychotherapy, Vol. II. Washington, D. C.: American Psychological Association, 1963; and O. Hobart Mowrer et al., Psychotherapy, Theory and Research. New York: Ronald Press, 1953, especially "Psychotherapy as Service and Research," pp. 3-6, and parts of "Historical and Philosophical Presuppositions for Understanding Therapy," (Rollo May), pp. 36-40. A helpful bibliography, summarizing published and unpublished research on a specific therapeutic method, is "Annotated Bibliography of Research and Theory Construction in Client-Centered Therapy" (Desmond S. Cartwright, Ed.). Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1957, Vol. 4, No. 1, 82-100.

For studies in social work and mental health, see, for example, Elizabeth Herzog, Some Guidelines for Evaluative Research Assessing Psycho-Social Change in Individuals. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Social Security Administration, Children's Bureau, 1959. The table of contents is particularly enlightening!;David G. French, An Approach to Measuring Results in Social Work. New York: Columbia University Press, 1952; Leonard S. Kogan, J. McVicker Hunt, and Phyllis F. Bartelme, A Follow-up Study of the Results of Social Casework. New York: Family Service Association of America, 1953; and Maurice H. Greenhill et al., (Eds.), Evaluation in Mental Health. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health,

For the purpose of this analysis, STIM considers three sets of events, all imbedded within a broad cultural context. These are the pre-training experience, including the selective factors, which precede any training program; the training experience itself, with the complexity of what goes on within and among people while training is in process; and the post-training experience, the participants' lives after the sensitivity training program is concluded.[8]

Education, and Welfare, Public Health Service, National Institutes of Health, National Institute of Mental Health, 1955). In addition to the annotated bibliography which constitutes most of the volume, pp. 21-29 contain some helpful comments concerning evaluation methodology. Also, for an overview of conceptual as well as research issues, see Martin Molins, "Measuring the Effect of Social Work Intervention," in Social Work Research, Norman A. Polansky (Ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960, Pp. 247-272.

There is a relative paucity of evaluative research in group psychotherapy, although a good deal of systematic inquiry is available focusing on group psychotherapeutic process. For a consideration of some obstacles to research in this area, see Warren G. Bennis, "A Critique of Group Therapy Research," International Journal of Group Psychotherapy, Vol. X. No. 1, January 1960, 63-77. For illustrative substantive studies see, for instance, Florence B. Powdermaker and Jerome D. Frank, Group Psychotherapy, Studies in Methodology of Research and Therapy, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1953, especially pp. 55-56, and pp. 333-358; and Arthur Lerner, "Self-Evaluation in Group Counseling with Male Alcoholics," International Journal of Group Psychotherapy, Vol. V, No. 3, July 1955, pp. 286-298.

For a massive treatment of theory and method in the assessment of teaching impact, see N. L. Gage (Ed.), Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963.

It is interesting to note that most of the investigations cited above show little cross-referencing to related inquiries falling "on the other side" of substantive boundary lines. Thus, there is yet to emerge an integrated field of evaluative inquiry, dealing -- not separately with psychotherapy, counseling, casework, and so on -- but rather oriented toward the systematic assessment of impact on individuals and groups of helping approaches genotypically viewed, whatever their current phenotypic labels.

[8]The term "participants" is used here, rather than "trainees" in order to indicate that issues considered apply in some sense to all persons taking part in the experience -- trainers as well as trainees. Generally, however, special emphasis will be placed on trainee characteristics and behavior.

These chronologically sequential sections may be transposed into the familiar pattern of before, during, and after. Though this trichotomy often is convenient, awareness that the flow of events is continuous through time, in the sense of a Jamesian stream of consciousness for instance, must serve as persistent caveat that data appearing as discrete measurements are time-bound abstractions.[9] The "flow" character of training, of its antecedents and aftermath, is existentially meaningful as viewed by the participants; further, it has implications for research design generally and for assessing the meaning of training "impact" specifically.[10]

While research often is focused on "people in training," i.e., trainees and trainers, STIM also reminds us of the significance of the changing social and nonsocial environment, external to the training situation at all points in time.

We may summarize the events occurring in the "experimental" phase of STIM as follows:

At the outset, a total population, within the setting of some pervasive culture, constitutes a source of potential participants. Each member of this population may be described at any time point in terms of specific personal and social patterns. The interpersonal matrix deals with the interactive and socio-perceptual patterns initially among potential participants and other persons and groups, and eventually among trainees, trainers,

---

[9] "Consciousness, then does not appear to itself chopped up in bits. Such words as 'chain' or 'train' do not describe it fitly... it is nothing joined; it flows. A 'river' or 'stream' are the metaphors by which it is most naturally described." William James, Principles of Psychology. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1890, Vol. 1, Chapter IX; variously reprinted and conveniently available in Thorne Shipley (Ed.) Classics in Psychology. New York: Philosophical Library, 1961. P. 168.

[10] Lately, a number of methodological treatises dealing specifically with change through time have been published, including Nathan Goldfarb, An Introduction to Longitudinal Statistical Analysis. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1960.

subgroups and groups in the training situation, as well as with social configurations outside the immediate training situation. The intrapersonal matrix is concerned with those factors whose primary referent is the self, be it trainer or trainee.

At some stage a selection funnel becomes differently operative on this population. This funnel determines who eventually becomes a participant in a given program. With reference to trainee selection, sources of information regarding sensitivity training, external constraints (such as distance), and decision making (integrating the various "pros and cons") operate in the course of this selection process. However, before a person in fact does become a trainee, the program's intake process constitutes a final possible barrier. Trainee selection by program staff or administration on an individual basis and/or in terms of group composition criteria may "screen out" certain persons prior to the beginning of the program itself or specify their placement in training. (Trainer selection, too, is to be reckoned with.) Later, as an extension of the selection funnel, patterns of absence and drop-outs are relevant to impact evaluation.

In the study of the sensitivity training experience itself, three orders of variables stand out: the program concept -- the objectives and design of the program -- and the interpersonal and intrapersonal matrices, within the program and outside it, whose general characteristics already have been noted. Here, attention is focused on the complex interplay of factors describing what goes on inside trainees and inside trainers, individually and in groups while training is under way.

Upon conclusion of the program -- in the course of the post-training experience -- follow-up research focuses on outcomes, particularly on changes or stability in the intrapersonal matrix, and in the interpersonal

matrix, exploring the continuing patterns of behavior, perception, and feeling "inside" the person and his changing relationships with his social environment.[11]

Finally, we shall need to consider briefly the matter of experimental logic: "How can we tell whether a change is due to sensitivity training or to something else?" The ubiquitous issue of development of control, quasi-control, or contrasting groups to provide suitable bases of comparison will conclude these first (and second) thoughts.

I. The Cultural Context

All events prior to, during, and after training of course proceed within the setting of a culture. Recognizing the diversity of concepts linked to the idea of culture, I shall for the present view culture primarily as a pervasive pattern of social influences -- pervasive in some spatial or geographic sense and pervasive in the sense of being enduring through time.[12] Substantively, of particular relevance to STIM are the broad systems of norms and values and their expression in terms of personality organization and group behavior that influence people's approach to a training experience. In this sense, the cultural milieu acts as the basic over-all framework which determines whether indeed sensitivity training will take place at all and, if it does, the expectations that trainees and trainers will have toward its process and outcomes.

---

[11] The "inside-outside" dichotomy concerning the individual and his social and physical surroundings, though occasionally arbitrary and consistently gradational, in my opinion, continues to be operationally useful, whatever the metaphysical objections.

[12] This is hardly the place to wrestle with the formidable conceptual and definitional issues inherent in attempts to delineate a rigorous view of "culture." However, for a sense of the nature of the problem, see A. L. Kroeber and Clyde Kluckhon. Culture -- A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions. New York: Vintage Books, 1963; originally published in 1952.

To the extent to which there are consistencies in personality and behavior within a given culture, as suggested by theorizing concerning "national character," we may expect corollary similarities in training experiences and results in similar cultures and differences in these respects in differing cultures.[13] To the extent to which there exist universal or cross-culturally general personality and behavior patterns, we may expect training experiences and outcomes that would be much alike, regardless of apparently diverse cultural situations.[14]

The evolution of sensitivity training itself may be viewed as an expression of particular culture-linked values. Moving from primary concerns with group behavior as a technique of democratic living, to later stress on individual growth, personal integrity, and self-realization, sensitivity training as an institution has developed a fluid subculture of its own.[15]

---

13 Ralph Linton speaks of "the basic personality type" as "that personality configuration [for any society] which is shared by the bulk of the society's members as a result of the early experiences which they have in common." See Abram Kradiner (with R. Linton, C. DuBois, and J. West), The Psychological Frontiers of Society. New York: Columbia University Press, 1945, p. viii. For an excellent summary and interpretational treatment of the topic, see Alex Inkeles and Daniel J. Levinson, "National Character: The Study of Modal Personality and Socio-cultural Systems," in Gardner Lindzey (Ed.), Handbook of Social Psychology, Vol. II. Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1954. Pp. 977-1020.

14 I have a feeling that there are some rather fundamental similarities in response to training at deeper levels, even in apparently different cultural settings. Perhaps culture determines the preferred patterns of defense, but then maybe there are some basic human values and needs that do emerge ultimately, independent of cultural context. Still, educational, economic, and ethnic differences must be reckoned with. At any rate, this is an area worthy of speculation and research, particularly as sensitivity training has been conducted (at more or less Westernized middle-class levels) in most major cultures, including the Orient and Africa.

15 What about the "NTL subculture"? How did it evolve and how has it changed over the years? What about culture contact and culture diffusion among NTL, European training approaches, the UCLA Human Relations Research Group, and other human relations training centers?

In turn, this subculture occupies a meaningful position within the broader configuration of the American (or English or Japanese or Italian....) culture milieu within which it may be lodged.

Of course, besides these vast national and international culture patterns, both the subcultures of organizations sponsoring a given training program and local and regional subcultures are relevant influences on training.

II. The Pre-training Experience

A. The Initial Total Population of Potential Trainees

Every sensitivity training program, indeed as any analogous "helping" experience, draws its members from some occasionally indistinct but potentially specifiable population. While we may assume that conceptually the most comprehensive source population simply is "all people" in a given cultural setting, the program's very approach and philosophy involve more drastic preselection.

1. Preselective Factors

a. First of all, geographic delimitation of the population often prevails -- the program may be confined to a particular local community or region; or a national program may, by virtue of its location, in fact address itself differentially to different geographic areas and thus select out certain subpopulations of probable participants.

b. Second, various socio-economic and/or occupational populations may be the initial "targets" of given programs. Some sensitivity training activities are aimed exclusively at members of

specific voluntary organizations, at persons in one or another professional group (engineers or physicians, for instance), at top executives, at supervisors, or at people directly working together in a formal organization. But as important as any explicit choice of population is the "built-in" preselectivity by socio-economic level. This is particularly apparent if the program's cost is substantial. For instance, a different population of potential trainees is defined if the fee is $400, as contrasted with the population reachable if the fee is $40. Whether the potential participant himself pays the fee or whether the company or other organization bears the financial responsibility becomes important initially in defining the population and later in affecting the trainee's motivational starting point.

c. Third, some aspects of the program's format serve to define a potential population in terms of time availability. For instance, one population may be attracted by a two-week, out-of-town summer laboratory, while another (though probably overlapping) population may be able to "get away" only for an evening once-a-week, ten-session arrangement. We shall consider program format in more detail on pages 30-32.

The significance of geographic, socio-economic/occupational, and format factors in defining the population to be reached lies in their effect of

preliminarily selecting certain kinds of people as possible participants. This selectivity in turn means that specific socio-cultural and institutional milieus will be differentially represented in a given program. This selectivity in turn may reflect systematic individual differences in outlook, expectations, and personality dynamics potentially affecting training. Indeed, we may wonder to what extent sensitivity training so far has been primarily a middle-class and upper-income level venture.

The most central and most persistently relevant aspects describing the total population are the interpersonal and intrapersonal matrices, briefly noted earlier. Their content on the whole is familiar. Their significance is apparent at the schema's starting point, but later it rises to become the very heart of the matter.

2. The Interpersonal Matrix

The interpersonal matrix is the interplay of social forces affecting the individual, generally equivalent to the social field of the individual's life space.[16] This matrix is defined fully by the network of perceptual, behavior, and affect relationships linking the individual with other people about him. For the total population from which trainees emerge eventually, one segment, the

---

16 Kurt Lewin, A Dynamic Theory of Personality. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1935. P. 175 and pp. 261-264. Also available in paperback edition, McGraw-Hill, 1962.

preselection interpersonal matrix, provides an appropriate baseline. The state of this matrix sets the social motivational context underpinning the selection of trainees and the training experience that follows.

Each cell indicates a <u>two-way</u> relationship between a person X in the population and a particular social unit studied, for instance, sociometrically, socio-perceptually, or in terms of observed behavior.[17] Selected for primary attention are the following:

a. <u>persons in the immediate family</u>

This includes the traditional members of the primary family constellation: husband, wife, children, siblings, parents, grandparents, and so on. Also, it may include more distant relatives of X, assuming that these play significant roles in X's life.

Considered as individuals, each person in this family constellation thus is part of a dyadic relationship with X. Cell a(i)[18] then, may be visualized further as a sub-matrix of intra-familial relations, of which X is part.

---

17 There is no intent here to spell out the full range of methodological approaches to the study of these relationships. However, characteristic methods are illustrated by J. L. Mereno (Ed.), <u>The Sociometry Reader</u>. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1960; Renato Tagiuri and Luigi Petrullo (Eds.), <u>Person Perception and Interpersonal Behavior</u>. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1958; Fritz Heider, <u>The Psychology of Interpersonal Relations</u>. New York: Wiley, 1958; Robert F. Bales, <u>Interaction Process Analysis</u>. Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Press, 1951; Erving Goffman, <u>The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life</u>. Garden City, New York: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1959; and in terms of briefer didactic treatments in many of the numerous textbooks on research methods in the social and behavioral sciences.

18 "i" for "individual."

Augmenting the dyadic network, Cell a(s)[19] draws attention to the relationship between person X and the family as a "group." Here, our concern is with the view of the family as a total operating system, a configuration of roles and of explicit and implicit functions. In terms of social perception, emphasis would be on perception of "my folks" or "the gang at home," rather than on a detailed differentiation pinpointing particular attitudes toward an individual, such as "my father" or "my wife."

b. personal friends

The basic logic of analysis for "personal friends" and for other social units to be considered generally follows that described for the family. Cell b(i) includes relationships between person X and the friends, as individuals, about him. Operationally, it becomes necessary to specify the meaning of "friends." This may be done by simple designation, originating with X. Or it may employ some combination of such designation by other members of X's family, or by other "informants" who may be presumed to be knowledgeable with respect to such aspects of X's life. Of course, following preliminary definition of a tentative "friend" population, additional empirical tests such as social distance scales, sociometric measures, and the like may be applied.

---

19 "s" for "system."

Cell b(s) is concerned with friendship groups, definable as informal or quasi-formal social units. These overlap with individual friends, per cell b(i), but likely will not be completely coterminous.

c. persons in membership groups

Cell c(i) includes relationships between person X and other individuals in the groups to which he belongs. For purposes of maintaining some separateness among the rubrics, we exclude from consideration in Cells c both friendship patterns, as covered by Cells b(i) and b(s), and formal occupational organizations discussed later.

Individuals in membership groups included for instance, X's associates in clubs and voluntary organizations, professional societies, and unions.

Again, in addition to concern with the individual persons in membership groups and their relationships with X, a significant set of phenomena are the links between X and the membership groups as entities, the relationship of X and each group as a whole, Cell c(s).

d. persons in occupational formal organization

A growing literature has mushroomed in the area of organization theory.[20] Individual human components of

---

20 For aspects of this literature, particularly as relevant in the present context, see the work of E. Wight Bakke; for instance in Mason Haire (Ed.), Modern Organization Theory. (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1959), especially pp. 45-46.

organization schemas, typically arranged in some hierarchical manner, normally are distinguished in terms of a "same level-up-down" trichotomy: peers, superiors, and subordinates. The interactions between X and these persons in the organization, Cell d(i), constitute one of several important interpersonal areas affecting X's possible involvement in a sensitivity training program, and ultimately the impact of the program itself.

As in prior cases, X's relations to others in the formal organization within which he works may be examined both as a configuration of two-way, individual-to-individual relations or in terms of X's ties to the organization as a total system, Cell d(s). Organizational sub-units such as departments, divisions, work groups, and the like, also may be considered within this category. Organizational climate is a significant variable affecting all phases of the individual's relationships to the training experience.

e. persons in reference positions

Cross-cutting, but often extending beyond the pattern of groups to which X belongs, are groups providing emotional or behavioral "yardsticks" -- reference points for X's feelings and actions.[21] These reference groups, Cell e(s), may be formal or informal in character; they may be highly localized in space and time (as a Ladies' Wednesday Tea and Whist Club) or broadly culture-based and continuing

---

21 For the definitive and much-quoted statement of reference group theory, see Robert K. Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1957, especially pp. 236-260 and pp. 281-386.

(as the American Middle Class or the Executive Community). Often these groups exert their influence on X as diffuse, globally perceived entities rather than through highly individualized relationships. The latter, however, may occur in the form of interrelations involving specific reference individuals, Cell e(i), "significant others," persons who derive their meaning to X because of their role within a reference group system (the charismatic leader of a social movement, for instance), or because of their special personal ties to X, such as an influential former teacher.

****

The interpersonal matrix may be conceptualized as an initially somewhat sketchy map of human relationships linking X and others, which may be brought into focus by subsequent systematic probing, exploring the nature and intensity of these relationships. A serial array of social relationships along a continuum of "personal significance" or "importance" for person X may be an appropriate starting point for analysis, both as a datum in its own right and as a way of making more meaningful the study of the interactions within each cell.

While STIM distinguishes the various cells within the interpersonal matrix, these cells must be viewed as heuristic devices rather than as genotypically discrete compartments. They draw attention to roughly distinguishable interpersonal relationship areas which are relevant to the study of training effects.

Next, we move to a brief consideration of the intrapersonal matrix.

3. The Intrapersonal Matrix

The intrapersonal matrix specifies the individual's personality dynamics and background especially relevant to study of sensitivity training process and outcome. Considering current interest and past investigations, my purpose here is to point to processes and functions that I believe to be especially deserving of systematic training research.[22] Operationally, of course, appropriate measures of aspects of the matrix emerge from specially devised and/or from a variety of standard research instruments, many of them of recent origin. Here are the selected components, or variables of the intrapersonal matrix:

a. the perceived self-concept

the person's total current view of himself as a

---

22 For a sampling of theoretic and operational underpinnings of the intrapersonal matrix, see Ruth C. Wiley, The Self Concept. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska, 1961; Carl R. Rogers, On Becoming a Person. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1961; and by the same author, with A. Walker and R. Rablen, "Development of a Scale to Measure Process Changes in Psychotherapy." J. clin. Psychol., 1960, Vol. 16, pp. 79-85; Abraham H. Maslow, Toward a Psychology of Being. Princeton, New Jersey: Van Nostrand, 1963, and an earlier book by the same author, Motivation and Personality. New York: Harpers, 1954; Eugene T. Gendlin, Experiencing and the Creation of Meaning. New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1962; Anselm L. Strauss, Mirrors and Masks. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1959; Gordon W. Allport, Personality and Social Encounter. Boston: Beacon Press, 1960, especially pp. 3-54 and pp. 95-135; Robert Tannenbaum, Irving R. Weschler, and Fred Massarik, Leadership and Organization. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961, especially pp. 22-66 and pp. 119-238. Op. cit., Leland P. Bradford, et al. (Eds.), T-Group Theory and Laboratory Method: Innovation in Re-education; Robert L. Katz, Empathy. New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1963; and William C. Schutz, FIRO: A Three-Dimensional Theory of Interpersonal Behavior. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1960.

In some instances, training practice, seeking change in aspects of the intrapersonal matrix, anticipated formal statement of theoretic positions, as illustrated above.

human being alone and in relationship with others;

b. the ideal self-concept

the person's view of his most highly desired condition as a human being alone and in relationship with others;

c. assumptions about perceptions others have of self

the person's view of how other people regard him: their attitudes, affect, cognitions directed toward him;

d. perceptions of others and social sensitivity

the person's view of others, and his skill in accurately assessing characteristics and dynamics of others (as individuals, groups, organizations, subcultures, and cultures), with special stress on accuracy in understanding individuals and groups;

e. self-insight

the person's skill in accurately assessing his own characteristics and dynamics;

f. behavioral flexibility and effectiveness

the person's repertoire of behaviors, and his capacity for behaving appropriately under varying conditions -- particularly in interpersonal situations;

g. openness to experience

the person's capacity for responding to cues, both social and nonsocial, and his capacity for meaningfully experiencing these cues as integral aspects of his total life pattern;

h. readiness for self-disclosure

the person's propensity for sharing with others

feelings about himself and, as appropriate, aspects of the self that initially were held private;

i. readiness to respond in terms of total experience

to self and others, including feelings at various levels of depth and intensity;

j. congruence

the relationship between the person's external behavior and his inner levels of experience; the extent to which conscious and unconscious aspects of personality organization constitute an integrated, internally consistent unity;

k. patterns of needs and defenses

the person's motivational modus operandi, particularly with respect to need hierarchy concepts, social needs, and dynamics of ego defense;

l. demographic and life history variables

socio-economic level, age, education, and so on, and consciously or unconsciously active effects of the person's unique history as a human being.

The above aspects of the intrapersonal matrix derive from a general conception of what sensitivity training seeks to accomplish. Statements of objectives, while varying in wording and intent, typically include some concern with heightened understanding of the self (a, b, c, e, above), with increased understanding of others (d), with enriched modes of experiencing and responding (g, h, i), with increased interpersonal effectiveness (f), and with significant aspects

of personality (j, k, l). We shall further consider training goals in a later section.

Variables (a) through (l) may be studied at three levels of complexity: First, each may be examined separately, one at a time, at any point in time, and equivalently through a series of points in time. Second, two-way interactions within sets of pairs of variables may be considered, as for instance the relationship between the trainee's self-concept (a) and his assumptions concerning how other trainees and trainer(s) regard him (c) -- before, during, and after training; or the relationship between congruence (h) and self-insight (e). These, of course, constitute the typical correlational approaches to personality measurement. Third, relationships among three or more variables, and patterns of variables may be investigated, not only in multiple correlational or factor analytic terms, but also in the sense of qualitatively-apperceived, clinical syndromes, or as Gestalten of relations, characterizing trainee or trainer, at one or another stage of the process.

The intrapersonal matrix is of importance not only with respect to the trainee and trainer populations, but initially it is germane to the description of the total populations from which such trainees and trainers eventually are selected. Few such total population data are available for comparison purposes.

B. The Selection Funnel

The road to actual participation in a sensitivity training program may be regarded as a subtle hurdle race, in whose course

motivational forces interact with a series of external facilitating events and barriers to participation. While these forces tend to operate sequentially, it may be important from a research standpoint to specify the patterns of events that lead to the inclusion of certain persons in the training experience and to the exclusion of others.

1. One obvious aspect of the selection funnel is the distribution of information concerning the program through media such as brochures, announcements, and word-of-mouth. This information may be available directly to members of the population, and/or to other individuals within the person's interpersonal matrix. The information directly at hand in a sense is processed and evaluated in terms of aspects of the intrapersonal matrix; it becomes an in-put to decision making regarding possible participation. Here, feelings of discomfort or lack in some personality area may give rise to emotional impetus toward participation. Or, in affirmative terms, desire to more fully explore new areas of experience may be a source of motivation. Unconscious as well as the more obvious conscious forces operate in establishing emotional predisposition.

   Information available to other persons may "get the wheels moving" toward person X, ultimately becoming a member of a training group. Word-of-mouth communication among former trainees may start a network of informal influence which may reach out toward person X.[23] Or, X's supervisor may decide,

---

[23] For relevant concepts and methods, see Elihu Katz and Paul F. Lazarsfeld, Personal Influence. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1955.

upon reading a brochure or article, that X "really could use this stuff...he gets into so much trouble with people...." Following up, he proposes X as a potential participant, with the fees paid by the company. In a different vein, personal experience in one or another sensitivity training program or in psychotherapy may motivate desire for further related experience and lead to participation in a subsequent program.

2. External constraints such as cost, time, and distance interact with motivational pushes and pulls to generate a "go no-go" decision. Competing opportunities for comparable activities other than a specific program and direct obstructions to participation reduce the number of persons who become potential participants.

3. Eventually, we may consider the ready-to-go group, the subgroup of the original population, poised at the threshold of participation. These are the people who, having made the "go decision" to take part in the program, send in their application forms. They are management personnel prepared to participate in an in-plant or executive training program and similar groups of "ready" potential trainees. But one more step remains, the program's intake process.

4. The intake process, and therefore final selection, may be wide-open: any member of the ready-to-go group automatically may be accepted. No explicit supplementary criteria, beyond those implicit in the delineation of the total population or in the general phase of the selection funnel, may be applied. On the other hand, there may be specific selection criteria, applied to individual persons in the ready-to-go group. These

criteria may take the form of formal or informal evaluations of the person's background, clinical interviews, psychological test results, and similar devices. They may be rooted in an explicit or implicit theory connecting characteristics of individual training group members and presumed training outcome. For instance, in basic sensitivity training programs, some effort may be made to screen out individuals who are severely disturbed; and in experimental or advanced programs, selection of generally "fully-functioning" persons may be aspired.

Another approach to the intake process may be concerned with "group mix" rather than solely with individual dynamics. Through devices such as FIRO-B,[24] a blend of interpersonal need patterns may be established, hypothesized to affect group functioning and individual learning.

Finally, intake may consider specific dyadic relationships. The psychodynamics of a particular trainer, for example, may be presumed to clash with those of a particular potential group member. Because of a "personality conflict" which may be expected to be unresolvable by a given training experience, certain trainees may not be accepted for the same group. Similarly, husbands and wives or prior acquaintances may be placed in different groups or programs.

At the present stage of the art, the efficacy of the intake process remains in doubt. As is the case for the total evaluation of training impact, it is necessary to

---

[24] Ibid. W. C. Schutz (1960).

test the specific propositions guiding intake, especially the hypothesized triple linkage of trainee, trainer, and group composition (and size) on one hand, and training outcome on the other.

5. A neglected area of conceptualization and research is the "infra-structure" of administrative relationships that lies behind trainee intake and trainer selection. Documented evidence of the precise process that occurs in saying "yea" or "nay" to the inclusion of particular trainees or trainers in a program largely is lacking. It is the grapevine of the "trainer community," stemming from this community's vaguely-defined subculture that mediates what little data are available on this topic.

C. The Selection Funnel: The Trainer Counterpart

A counterpart to the selection funnel affecting trainees is the selection process of trainers. Criteria such as those promulgated by NTL in connection with associate or fellow status[25] and other evaluations of trainer personality and skill operate prior to the beginning of the actual program. Trainer training, the selection of interns, and similar steps establish a background from which trainer selection as such ultimately is made. Indeed, every major step in the selection funnel involving trainees has its replica in trainer selection; although, of course, "being asked to do a lab," and the trainer's motivation to say "yea" or "nay" is of additional substantive interest.

---

25 See criteria, dittoed memorandum, National Training Laboratories.

III. The Training Experience

A. Behind the events that take place in the course of an actual program lies a program concept -- some more-or-less abstract blueprint of what the program should be. This normative conception of the program evolves at two levels: training design, especially objectives and format, as contemplated by trainers and/or administrative staff; and training design, as anticipated by trainees. Indeed, these two sides of the coin have been operative already in delimiting the trainee population and in affecting events of the selection funnel. Further, they are by no means static: important aspects of format often are altered in the course of the program itself; trainees' expectations change; and views of objectives are modified through time.[26]

---

26 For discussions of goals, see Warren G. Bennis, "Goals and Meta-Goals of Laboratory Training," Human Relations Training News, Vol. 6, N_o. 3, Fall 1962; and Edwin C. Nevis, "The Trainee's Goals in Laboratory Training," Human Relations Training News, Vol. 7, No. 2, Summer 1963. Changes in goals, as defined by training staff, especially relative emphasis on individual or group behavior change, have been in evidence throughout the history of laboratory training. See, for example, unpublished letter of David H. Jenkins to Irving R. Weschler, October 26, 1961: "The question of goals in sensitivity training is one about which I am becoming increasingly concerned. If I recollect correctly, the early National Training Laboratories' training was not oriented toward sensitivity as such; it was oriented toward skill training (the groups were called basic skill training groups). The concept that was active was that awareness of a situation and ability to diagnose it were requirements for effective skill development. The skill emphasis at that time was on interpersonal relations and effective leadership. The BST group experiences, as different from the work activities of the group, were utilized to help people understand groups. As you recall, the first laboratories were laboratories in group development. It seems to me that the increased emphasis on sensitivity training as such is a relatively recent development. I believe it was accompanied by or developed from the separation of the T Group from skill training. As I understand this direction, it is an increased emphasis on self- and other-awareness in relationship to group situations. It tends to reduce both the skill aspect and the understanding of group processes aspect, as I see it."

In terms of interpersonal process, the program concept may be viewed as a system of expectations, particularly involving trainer and trainees. These expectations may be conscious or unconscious, intellectual or emotional, ambiguous or specific.

1. Objectives

Program objectives are stated in a variety of ways and with a number of emphases. At any rate, any such statement is characterized by overlap and interrelation among objectives that seem discrete. Illustrative of goal areas, especially as enunciated by trainer staff, are the following:

a. heightened understanding of self

deepening of self-insight, discovery of one's own blindspots, exploration of one's facades and defenses, opening up one's potential for full personality development and personal growth;

b. heightened understanding of other individuals

deepening of insight into personality dynamics of others, including understanding of their blind spots, facades, and defenses as well as their personal strengths;

c. heightened understanding of group behavior

deepening of insight into process of group development and growth, diagnosis of group atmosphere, group culture, role specialization among group members;

d. heightened understanding of subcultural and cultural behavior

deepening of insight into dynamics of communities and other social systems, power structure, differences and similarities among diverse cultural and ethnic groups;

e. increasing effectiveness of interpersonal behavior

particularly in key life areas -- on the job, at home, in community, broadening one's repertoire of behaviors (behavioral flexibility) so that appropriate behavior patterns may be available when needed;

f. development of specific skills

perceptual skills -- ability to be aware of, and interpret gestural, postural, expressive, and other nonverbal cues; behavior skills -- ability to make use of techniques such as interviewing, counseling, and role playing; listening skills -- intellectual-emotional skills -- becoming more creative through spontaneous art, poetry, movement, music, literature;

g. "meta-learning"

learning how to learn more effectively, particularly by eliminating emotional blockages, and by experiencing new learning approaches.

The concept of objectives, as held by members of initial population, by subpopulations at various stages of the selection funnel, by the ready-to-go group, and ultimately by the actual trainees, overlaps but is not identical with the concept as formulated by the trainer staff. Indeed, different trainers vary in their intellectual

emphases as to appropriate objectives. Further, objectives as stated formally do not necessarily correspond to objectives as experienced at a deeper level, either by trainers or by potential or actual trainees.

There is no necessary assumption, of course, that the personal or social desirability of any specified "objective" is a linear function. "Too much" insight into certain areas of self or others may, it can be argued, prove to be a detriment. And a certain "amount" of heightened insight for one person may have a very different meaning from a quantitatively similar insight gain for another, whose needs and personal objectives differ.

The objectives puzzle therefore needs to be unraveled at several levels:

(1) Whose perceptions of objectives are being studied? Those of the initial population, the population in the selection funnel, the potential participants "ready-to-go," trainees, trainers? Or bystanders, not involved in any phase of the program?

(2) At what stage during the training experience are perceptions of objectives being studied? At the very outset, at a crucial or quiescent point during the program, in a state of euphoria or depression? Right at the end?

It is evident that change in expectations regarding objectives through time and that differences among expectations in the several populations are relevant research focal points. As a program proceeds, for instance, particular events in the training experience may give rise to trainees' feelings which "open doors" to wholly new ways of regarding interpersonal relationships and the experience itself.

As this occurs, the perception of what the program is all about and what it is "supposed" to do evidently changes as well.

2. Format

Certain major aspects of the program format are relatively binding and exert their influence early, especially in the course of the selection funnel. Others remain fluid and often are subject to revision during the program itself.[27] The relatively binding aspects include what might be regarded as the "outer boundaries" of the format, while the more fluid ones constitute the program's "inner workings," its interior architecture.

a. The following are the major (more or less) binding aspects of the format:

(1) total program length, including starting and ending dates;

(2) the program's principal time segments: out-of-town and all-day sessions, sequence of weekly meetings, and the like.

(3) general geographic location, including "live-in" or "live-at-home" arrangements;

b. More typically fluid aspects of format are the following:

---

27 Numerous statements dealing with training format are available, including Douglas R. Bunker and Dorothy J. Mial, Training Designs for Human Relations Laboratories, 1960. Washington, D.C.: National Training Laboratories, 1960, mimeographed; Gunnar Hjelholt and Matthew B. Miles, Extending the Conventional Training Laboratory Design. Washington, D.C.: National Training Laboratories' Subscription Service, Number One, 1963; T. J. Mallinson, ibid., Subscription Service, Number Three, 1963; Leland P. Bradford, Jack R. Gibb, and Gordon Lippitt, "Variations in Human Relations Training Design," Human Relations Training News, Vol. 7, No. 1, Spring 1963.

(1) arrangement of social configurations in training:

(a) small-group experiences: group size, composition, and meeting frequency: "T Groups," "basic groups," "small groups," skill groups, task groups, dyads, and so on.

(b) large-group experiences: group size, composition, and meeting frequency: e.g., general or theory sessions, "giant conversations," "tribes," among others.

(c) assigned member roles, e.g., process observation, observation of nonverbal behavior, and so on.

(d) free time.

(e) meal arrangements (e.g., Who sits with whom?).

(f) housing arrangements, (e.g., if live in, Who bunks with whom?).

(2) use of training devices:

(a) diaries to be completed by trainees and/or trainers.

(b) films, music, dance, and the like.

(c) tape recordings of counseling or group experiences.

(d) exercises, and structured approaches, e.g., "programmed learning," instrumented techniques, and so on.

(e) evaluation devices "built into" format, e.g., operational research, meeting reaction studies, among others.

(f) readings and take-home kits.

Clearly, research may be designed exploring possible optimum formats -- desirable group size, blend of different social configurations, and effectiveness of various training

devices as these contribute to attainment of various training goals.

It is quite possible that, within certain limits, differences in format as such mean little in terms of training process and dynamics. On the other hand, format is the concrete implementation of the assumptions held by training staff as to the kinds of social and physical configurations most conducive to attainment of training objectives. Thus, a more detailed taxonomy of training formats minimally provides a context within which training process can be understood. Further, in conjunction with consideration of other variables, systematic specification of format configurations provides a basis for assessing the nature of the independent variable ("training") ostensibly related to changes in the dependent variable ("training impact").

B. Within-Program Process: The Training Matrix

The greatest amount of research to date has focused on training process as it occurs during the program itself and on relationships between this process and other factors, particularly changes in personality variables, perception, and the like.[28] Generically, training process may be defined as the pattern of all intrapersonal and interpersonal events involving trainees, trainers, and other staff as these occur within the framework of a particular training program.[29]

---

[28] Bibliographies cited earlier contain references to much of this fairly voluminous literature which I cannot abstract here. op, cit., Stock (1964), Durham and Gibb (1960), et al. Also, see the excellent monograph to which my attention kindly was guided by W. H. McWhinney: R. Meigniez et al., Evaluation of Supervisory and Management Training Methods, (n.p.: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, 1961).

[29] Interactions during training with "outsiders," such as visitors, also are relevant.

By this definition we consider not only interactions within the T Group or its variants, but also we include events taking place in the other social configurations of training, e.g., in large groups and general sessions, free time, meals, and so on. The training matrix may be regarded as a special case of the interpersonal matrix.

In the schema, cells along the diagonal: XX, T_xT_x, YY, and T_yT_y, denote the intrapersonal matrix during training variously for a given trainee X, for other trainee(s) Y, for X's trainer T_x, and for other trainers(s) T_y. It specifies the interaction within the personality of a given trainee (or trainer), i.e., the self-confrontation of the trainee (or trainer) during training and his personality characteristics in process. The concepts of trainer dynamics and trainee dynamics fit in this context. In this sense, the intrapersonal matrix is concerned with training events engaging the trainee's (or trainer's) perceived and ideal self-concepts, with the inner dynamics of his assumptions about others, his perceptions of others and social sensitivity, his self-insight, his behavioral flexibility and effectiveness, his openness to experience, readiness for self-disclosure, readiness to fully respond to self and others, his congruence and his patterns of needs and defense.

While the focus here is on the intrapersonal events occurring during training, these events are, of course, tied to the social world by a nexus of interpersonal events -- by the interactions with other persons.[30] Trainer role and trainee

---

[30] Surely, the interfaces of "self" and "society" are areas of continuous interchange, or transaction. Yet pragmatically and operationally it seems clear to me that in terms of research implementation, data are invariably generated by the individual person, vis-à-vis himself or others and that, in this sense, the "person"/"rest of the world" distinction continues to be both necessary and meaningful.

(member) role are relevant here.

Within the program's framework, the most significant sets of relationship are those between a given trainee X and other trainees Y,[31] (cells XY and YX), and those between trainee X and "his" group's "trainer,"[32] (cells XT_x, T_xX). Relationships between a given trained and trainers other than those directly involved in his own group are noted in cells XT_y, T_yX, and YT_x, T_xY. A given trainer's interactions with fellow trainer(s) (cells T_xT_y, T_yT_x) constitute additional relationships worthy of study. These relationships may be considered dyadically among individuals or in terms of total group and subgroup relations, analogous to those noted in the earlier treatment of the interpersonal matrix.[33] Further, relationships with other staff are of significance.

---

31 The most dynamic and promising conceptualization of trainee interaction, in my opinion, is that proposed by James V. Clark, "Authentic Interaction and Personal Growth in Sensitivity Training Groups." J. of humanistic Psychol., Vol. 2, No. 2, Spring 1963.

32 For trainer-to-trainee interaction, see, for instance, the conceptual work of Jerome Reisel in Leadership and Organization, Robert Tannenbaum, Irving R. Weschler, and Fred Massarik, Chapter 12; William G. Dyer, "An Inventory of Trainer Interventions," Human Relations Training News, Vol. 7, No. 1, Spring 1963; and James V. Clark, "Some Troublesome Dichotomies in Human Relations Training," Human Relations Training News, Vol. 6, No. 1, Spring 1962; as well as the broadly relevant Emotional Dynamics and Group Culture, by Dorothy Stock and Herbert A. Thelen. Washington, D.C.: National Training Laboratories, 1958.

Also see Jerome Reisel, "Observations on the Trainer Role: A Case Study," in Robert Tannenbaum, Irving R. Weschler, and Fred Massarik, Leadership and Organization. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961. Pp. 188-205.

33 See the "s" cells, involving systems or group relations, pp. 10-14.

The investigation of training groups and programs in terms of the subculture concept, tying in with the cultural context notion, continues to be of interest.[34] Finally, the physical (nonsocial) context exerts potentially important effects on the training experience.

Consideration needs to be given to the intrapersonal and interpersonal matrices characterizing absentees and drop-outs.

C. A classification of the interpersonal processes that may be studied in connection with the training matrix (or with any other interpersonal matrix) can be nearly as inclusive as the field of social psychology itself. The following broad process areas are particularly relevant:

1. perceptual patterns: How do trainees and trainers view each other?...What are their reciprocal images...expectations...attitudes...? How do trainees and trainers view people in general and specific other persons outside the laboratory setting?

2. overt behavior patterns: What do trainees and trainers do? in terms of verbal communication? in terms of gestural-postural cues? in terms of facial expressive cues? in terms of use of inanimate objects? (e.g., manipulation of cigarette, use of desk or chair, and so on?)

3. affect patterns: How do trainees and trainers feel about the intra- and interpersonal events unfolding during training? How do they feel as they experience the events themselves?

---

[34] The concept of the "cultural island" is well known in this connection.

A vast variety of theoretic statements and operational versions of the above three major process areas is available and has been applied in systematic study of within-program process.[35] These applications, while inevitably treating individual trainees and trainers as data sources, may be aimed at explicating group phenomena as well as individual phenomena.

This sector of the schema probably ranks above all others in the richness of findings and in the ingenuity of research effort. Conceptually, the difficulty often lies in the relatively tenuous link between this within-program research on one hand and the "external" before, during, and after program events affecting trainee and trainer, on the other.

D. Outside-Program Process

Concurrent with programs (other than those conducted within an isolated or "cultural island" setting), outside-program process -- interactions among program participants and their families, friends, co-workers on the job, and others -- proceeds in its daily course. These interactions complexly intertwine

---

[35] Bibliography bearing on this topic is too extensive to be included here. It would need to encompass much of the areas of social perception, interpersonal interaction, verbal and nonverbal communication, expressive behavior, social motivation, and so on, as well as citation of the considerable number of hand-tailored instruments devised for study of the interpersonal aspects of laboratory research. Of course, data collection, in within-program process, in study of other socio-psychological configurations, can take the usual forms of (i) pencil-and-paper instruments administered to trainees and trainers, (ii) interviews, ranging along the continuum of structure -- open end, (iii) projective and other indirect measuring devices, (iv) participant observation, and (v) nonparticipant observation. While all these data-collection types are represented in available inquiries, methods (i) and (ii) tend to be the most popular, suggesting that future design strategies increasingly may wish to utilize (iii), (iv), and (v), particularly in order to probe the nonaware and complex global aspects of training behavior.

with the ongoing events in the training experience, reciprocally influencing and being influenced. Indeed, they may be regarded as important extensions of the program format itself, either with intent in program design or by indirection. The people "back home" provide immediate opportunities for "trying out" and testing assumed learnings of the training experience. They provide a sounding board. They are sources of support or rejection. Whether affectively neutral, accepting, or hostile they inevitably are a fountainhead of questions: "What's going on in the program?....What happened last night?...." And the answers are not easy to formulate.[36] The impact of these immediate reinforcing or anomic experiences with persons who play significant roles in the trainees' lives requires careful assessment. This impact may be exerted at least at two interdependent levels: (1) interactions *with persons* outside the program may condition subsequent events in the program itself; and (2) the outside-program interactions establish the basis on which long-term, relatively enduring relationships are built. To the extent to which the persons outside the program thus are differentially supportive of possible learning derived by the trainee during training, the prediction as to how useful the experience shall become in the long run becomes partly self-fulfilling. A climate hostile to application of glimmerings of learning

---

36 I am inclined to speculate that how a trainee manages to respond to questions such as these constitutes a potentially useful measure of awareness of his "progress" in training or perhaps a measure of prognosis of how well the experience may "take" later on. Does he choose to deny any emotional content? Does he become defensive? Is he able to articulate at least some aspects of the experience? If so, what aspects does he select and with what affect does he treat them? Unconscious impact, of course, inherently defies direct explication in response to such questioning; although one may attempt interpretations of unconscious dynamics as revealed in this context.

concurrent with the program may undermine the likelihood that the trainee will try to bring these learnings into play again at a later time, either consciously or unconsciously. In turn, he may be prevented from integrating these learnings if he lacks reference group support; such lack of integration in turn stacks the odds against subsequent enhancement of his personal and social effectiveness.

The inside-outside distinction in a sense is an artifact of the nature of the format. If the training experience proceeds in a "cultural island" setting, one in which trainees and trainers are together continuously for the duration of the program, concurrently there can be little or no outside-program process -- except perhaps by thimking about what's going on "back home" -- perchance by a clandestine "trip to town," or by an occasional telephone call. Under these conditions there exists little possible risk of nonsupportive back-home interaction, nor can there be benefits of potential helpful integration of training learnings with the "real world" while these learnings are freshly evolving. The use of so-called "family"-type designs, bringing together real-world groupings in the framework of the training process, therefore represents approaches to direct confrontation of persons who also must deal with one another in the normal course of their lives. Likewise, organization therapy, milieu therapy, and training affecting total interpersonal systems seek to fuse the change process and actual life experience.[37]

---

37 For instance, see Maxwell Jones, The Therapeutic Community. New York: Basic Books, 1953.

Not only are trainee interactions with persons outside the program during its progress of concern, but so indeed are outside interactions affecting the trainers. Within the context of the trainer's key reference groups, support for his particular role in the program, for instance, may affect the character of his subsequent interventions. And at the unconscious level, his need satisfactions and personal conflicts in the day-by-day world may "splash over" into his perceptual, behavioral, and affective patterns in the training program. This in turn conditions the nature of the training experience as a whole and becomes part and parcel of kthe interactive web of relationships in the training process.

IV. The Post-Training Experience: The Continuity of Life

We have been concerned with the social and personal events whose impact has concerned us prior to training and "on the outside" during training itself. Now, measures in the interpersonal and intrapersonal matrices assume special significance because at this point their character may be viewed as criteria par excellence of training impact. Inevitably, simple cause-and-effect statements relating training and outcome are doomed to failure. As we have noted, the social context outside training is a variable affecting training process itself. Beyond the cross-sectional comparisons of trainee characteristics before, during, and after training, the specific interplay between learnings attributed to training and the post-training social context may prove to be worthwhile. Particularly to the extent to which learnings may be unconscious, highly individualized, and subject to being activated by subtle stimuli,

this interaction between trainee's perceptual behavior and affective patterns in the context of the post-training social field looms important.

Further, learnings may be cumulative or chain-reactions. A given new insight, in and of itself judged trivial, may spark subsequent behavior changes of considerable importance. And some learning may lie fallow, showing apparently "no change" in simple before-after testing at a given "after" point, while at a somewhat later point -- due to the operation of other factors within or around the person -- a major change increment may appear.[38]

Concerns with test-retest effects, recall, subject "mortality," and other methodological issues likewise arise. Longitudinal study and panel design become appropriate for the present purpose. In turn, substantive questions may be raised as to the most meaningful time periods for which follow-up research on training is productive; at what point has most (or all?) training impact taken effect? Probably, answers cannot be provided on a priori theoretical grounds, but will have to await systematic empirical inquiry. But such inquiry, making repeated measures in time, is urgently needed.

Finally, we might focus on the culture, organization, or group to which the trainee returns at program's end. In considering the interpersonal matrix, we have already noted the interplay between the individual and the various social

---

[38] This is analogous to the well-known "sleeper effect" in studies of persuasion or attitude change in communication, viz., Carl I. Hovland, Irving L. Janis, and Harold H. Kelley, Communication and Persuasion. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1953. P. 244 ff.

constellations with which he deals. Now, culture, organization, or group may be regarded as the dependent variable: Has the trainee's participation effected changes in any one (or several) of these social structures? This question is asked most often with respect to organizational change, particularly in following training programs for members of industrial or other formal organizations. Indeed, there are numerous sensitivity training programs whose primary goal is organizational change (via individual change), among them training activities conducted in companies such as TRW/Space Technology Laboratories, Aerojet-General, Pacific Finance, Esso-Standard, Aluminum Company of Canada, Ishikawajima Harima Heavy Industrial Company in Japan, and a number of concerns in Europe. However, the question of change applies equally to other areas suggested by the interpersonal matrix, particularly to social patterns of family and friendship groups.

****

We have now completed the trainee's Odyssey from the earliest stages of his presence in some roughly defined population to his involvement with life, long after the training program has come and gone.[39] We must now raise a final point: What if the trainee had "done something else" -- something other than the particular training experience here considered? What if he had gone about his ways "as always"? What if he had read a

---

39 A variant, "the Odyssey begun anew," may be considered; we may wish to focus some research on the effects of repeated exposure to sensitivity training, as, for instance, for people who participate several times in relatively similar or "advanced" programs, and on the effects the returned trainee has on others in his interpersonal matrix upon (repeated) exposure to training.

book, listened to a lecture, participated in a revival meeting, imbibed psychedelic or hallucinogenic drugs, or anything else?

V. A Brief Note on the Ubiquitous Control Group Problem

Evaluative designs vary widely in their coming to grips with the question of control group procedure. The difficulties involved in systematically devising control groups in behavioral science research are too well known to warrant treatment here.[40] A series of alternative designs will be considered in a separate paper. It is evident from a consideration of the selection funnel concept that certain subpopulations come only to the threshold of sensitivity training. One approach to control group construction, of course, is the acceptance of one random portion of the ready-to-go-group to the program, and the rejection of another random portion. Or a more complex variation of the same logic may, if the number of "applicants" is sufficient, call for the simultaneous offering of systematically different training designs, embodying varying amounts of didactic procedures, program lengths, group sizes and compositions, and so on. The practical difficulties in the implementation of designs such as these are many.

Development of groups not in training matched a priori on major social and personality characteristics to simulate these characteristics of actual training groups needs to consider the possible differential effects of awareness of sensitivity training program offerings, motivations toward becoming involved in

---

40 For an insightful consideration of many of the relevant issues, see Herbert H. Hyman, Charles R. Wright, and Terence K. Hopkins, Application of Methods of Evaluation: Four Studies of the Encampment for Citizenship. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1962. Pp. 3-86.

such training, and other factors operative in the selection funnel that lead some people to seek and others to reject the training experience.

Any attempts to develop matched groups must face the challenge that for small numbers of cases (bounded by the requirements of small-group size) a large number of subtle variables must be dealt with. To solve this problem by increasing the number of groups, one must consider matching styles or different trainers and the potentially diverse interaction patterns that may prevail in different group experiences.

Strategically, a number of approaches may prove useful:

A. The development of control group designs following exhaustive specification of the variables demonstrably germane to the measurement of outcomes. On this basis, it may be possible to concentrate on matching groups in terms of selected factors whose importance will not simply be assumed but whose interconnections with outcome variables will be based on empirical and theoretical evidence. Thus, the number of factors on which matchings may be needed may be reduced, and matching may become more feasible.

B. The fostering of readiness on the part of training staff and administration to "turn back" matched or randomly selected applicants in order to undertake measurements on these applicants as quasi-control groups, hypothetical groups whose members do not go through training. Though the very act of "rejecting" an applicant may be a factor worthy of note, such quasi-groups generally should resemble actual groups

on certain dimensions relevant to outcome, particularly in terms of having been filtered through the same general selection funnel. Because no specific group experience needs to be created, larger numbers of cases -- randomizing for differential real-life experiences -- may be included in this genre of design.

As a variant, instead of "turning them back," randomly chosen applicants may be exposed to systematically varied learning experiences other than sensitivity training (but generally described in similar terms) to constitute further sets of quasi-control groups.

C. The naturalistic description and detailed standardized measurement of perceptual, behavioral, and affective patterns in the widest possible variety of groups, to generate a broad data base, which then provides raw material for ex post facto experimentation.

A substantial reservoir of data would make possible holding constant by manipulation of data, if not by direct manipulation of subjects, variables relevant to outcome measurement, and the corresponding indirect assessment and comparison of outcomes.[41]

Even when rigorous comparisons cannot be made, a useful statistical or clinical "feel" of differences should emerge as one examines patterns of variables that appear linked to particular outcomes in sets of "contrasting groups." Generally, focusing attention

---

[41] See Ernest Greenwood, Experimental Sociology. New York: King's Crown Press, 1945.

on study of contrasting groups, rather than fixating exclusively on control group concepts, may provide a promising middle-ground, eschewing bland measurement devoid of casual implication on one hand, and often unattainable mechanical rigor on the other.

Indeed, any kind of human relations training, whatever its orientation or name, is but another, rather brief slice of life. Its blood and marrow necessarily is that of social and personal life itself, the transaction of human relationships, and the consequent derivation of conscious and unconscious meaning within heart and mind of the individual. When seeking to assess the impact of sensitivity training we may aspire to the utmost in precision and scientific care. But, as the tangles of causality in life as a whole still remain labyrinthine, so measurement of sensitivity training impact no doubt will continue for some time to come to blend the injunctions of exactness with the pleasant necessity of intuition.

VI. Summary

Sensitivity training (and its variants) has become a widely used, and even more widely discussed, training method. Probably because it does reach significant and often tender areas of human personality and behavior, it has evoked strong positive and negative feelings.

While there has been a growing, though uneven body of research bearing on sensitivity training process and impact, there has been little unity in research approach or consistency in research strategy. Under any circumstances, each researcher obviously can concern himself only with a limited aspect of the complex totality involved in the systematic study of sensitivity training.

It is the purpose of this paper to develop a comprehensive framework that may order existing sensitivity training research and that may guide future research efforts. It is my hope that this schema, the sensitivity training impact model, STIM, may help us to identify more clearly how present research efforts fit together, where there are gaps in our knowledge, and the directions which future research should take. For the individual researcher, this model may serve to lay out the many, often uncontrolled and contextual variables not dealt with fully in any given study design.

STIM considers the flow of events through time, within a broad cultural context, commencing at some point in a pre-training experience, continuing through the training experience and concluding at some point during post-training experience. STIM follows the initial total population, preselecting potential participants, the selection funnel through which some of them move before becoming ready to take part in the program, and the intake process leading to final selection. It is noted that these selection steps apply to trainer as well as to trainee.

Again, both for trainees and trainers, key psychological and social variables to be considered in research are classified in terms of an interpersonal matrix and an intrapersonal matrix. The interpersonal matrix considers relationships between trainee (or trainer) with persons in his immediate family, personal friends, persons in membership groups, persons in occupational formal organizations, and persons in reference positions, in each case viewed as individuals or as groups (or systems) of relationships. The intrapersonal matrix concerns the web of interconnections among selected individual, dynamic variables, specifically the perceived

self-concept, the ideal self-concept, assumptions about perceptions others have of self, perceptions of others, self-insight, behavioral flexibility and effectiveness, openness to experience, congruence, readiness for self-disclosure, readiness to respond in terms of total experience, patterns of needs and defenses, and demographic and life history variables.

During the training experience, in the specific subcultural and physical context, the interpersonal matrix is elaborated by what transpires in within-program process; this, of course, is primarily the arena of relationships among trainees and trainers, as individuals and as groups. Other aspects of the interpersonal matrix are involved in outside-program process, concurrent with the training experience, when applicable.

Interpersonal processes examined particularly in the training matrix are the perceptual patterns, overt behavior patterns and affective patterns linking trainees and trainers. Clearly, the same processes are relevant to study of the interpersonal matrix in the outside-program process.

Events in the intrapersonal matrix are of special importance in the study of the internal psychological dynamics of trainees and trainers during training.

Further, of significance in the systematic investigation of the training experience are the program concept, the program objectives as viewed by trainers and trainees, and program format.

Measurements of the interpersonal and intrapersonal matrices, upon the conclusion of the program, provide measures of training outcome, for individuals and for larger social entities, such as organizational, family, and friendship relationship patterns.

Yet, while attention to evaluation of impact is of undoubted importance, demonstrations of sensitivity training "success" may not convince all of its most adamant opponents, nor may indications of its "failure" weaken the faith of its overly zealous proponents. Ultimately, we may hope that a deeper understanding of the entire sensitivity training process will provide a sense of balance to the field, enriching training practice, and satisfying our urge to grasp a subtle and exciting aspect of relationships among human beings.

THE LIBRARY OF
SEP 5 1967
CONTINUING EDUCATION

I. THE CULTURAL CONTEXT

II. THE PRE-TRAINING EXPERIENCE

III. THE TRAINING EX

A. Program Conce

1. Objectives:
   a. heightened understanding of self
   b. heightened understanding of other individuals
   c. heightened understanding of group behavior
   d. heightened understanding of sub-cultural and cultural behavior
   e. increasing effectiveness of interpersonal behavior
   f. development of specific skills
   g. meta-learning

2.

A. Initial Total Population: (trainees)

1. "pre-selective factors
   a. geographic
   b. socio-economic/ occupational
   c. formal

B. The Selection Funnel: (trainees)

1. Distribution of Information
2. External Constraints

Person X's in/out decision → in decision → 3. Ready to-go Group → 4. Intake Process → final decision → (entry into training)

out decision

5. (infra-structure)

C. The Selection Funnel: The Trainer Counterpart

B. Within-Program Process: T
(The Interpersonal Matrix in the

trainee	trainer T_x	trainer
	X	T_x	Y
trainee X (including absentees drop-outs)	X X	X T_x	X X
trainer T_x	T_x X	T_x T_x	T_x Y
trainee Y	Y X	Y T_x	Y Y
trainer T_y	T_y X	T_y T_x	T_y Y

2. THE INTERPERSONAL MATRIX ... before training

	a. persons in the immediate family	b. personal friends	c. persons in membership groups	d. persons in occupational/ formal organizations	e. persons in reference positions
person X	$a_{(1)}$	$b_{(1)}$	$c_{(1)}$	$d_{(1)}$	$e_{(1)}$
	$a_{(n)}$	$b_{(n)}$	$c_{(n)}$	$d_{(n)}$	$e_{(n)}$

(II. - 2. continued)

C. Interpersonal Process
1. perceptual pattern
2. overt behavior patt
3. affective patterns

D. Outside-Program Pro
(The Interpersonal Matrix,
Training Situation while T
Progress)
...of trainee
...of trainer

3. THE INTRAPERSONAL MATRIX ... before training

	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h	i	j	k	l
perceived self-concept a.												
ideal self-concept b.												
assumptions about perceptions others have of self c.												
perceptions of others, and social sensitivity d.												
self-insight e.												
behavioral flexibility and effectiveness f.												
openness to experience g.												
readiness for self-disclosure h.												
readiness to respond in terms of total experience i.												
congruence j.												
patterns of needs and defenses k.												
demographic and life history variables l.												

The Intrapersonal Matrix ... d
(II. - 3 continued)

See Diagonal of Training M
...of trainee (XX, YY)
...of trainer (T_xT_x, T_yT_y)

M_1 (measurements before training)

M_2 (measurements immediately at start of training)

ST M_3 (sensitivity training measurements dur training)

Diagram

A SENSITIVITY TRAINING

III. THE TRAINING EXPERIENCE

A. Program Concept

1. Objectives:
   a. heightened understanding of self
   b. heightened understanding of other individuals
   c. heightened understanding of group behavior
   d. heightened understanding of sub-cultural and cultural behavior
   e. increasing effectiveness of interpersonal behavior
   f. development of specific skills
   g. meta-learning

2. Format:
   a. binding aspects: total length, principal time segments general geographic location
   b. fluid aspects: social configurations in training, training devices

IV. THE POST-TRAINING EXPERIENCE (The Continuity of Life)

final decision → (entry into training)

B. Within-Program Process: The Training Matrix
(The Interpersonal Matrix in the training situation)

	trainee X	trainer T_X	trainee Y	trainer T_Y	other staff
trainee X (including absentees drop-outs)	X X	X T_X	X Y	X T_Y	
trainer T_X	T_X X	T_X T_X	T_X Y	T_X T_Y	sub-culture and physical (non-social) context (of the training experience)
trainee Y	Y X	Y T_X	Y Y	Y T_Y	
trainer T_Y	T_Y X	T_Y T_X	T_Y Y	T_Y T_Y	

(II. - 2. continued)

The Interpersonal Matrix ... after training
(II. - 2. continued)

C. Interpersonal Processes
1. perceptual patterns
2. overt behavior patterns
3. affective patterns

D. Outside-Program Process
(The Interpersonal Matrix, Outside the Training Situation while Training is in Progress)
...of trainee
...of trainer

The Intrapersonal Matrix ... during training
(II. - 3 continued)

See Diagonal of Training Matrix
...of trainee (XX, YY)
...of trainer (T_XT_X, T_YT_Y)

The Intrapersonal Matrix ... after training
(II. - 3. continued)

M_2 (measurements immediately at start of training)

ST M_3 (sensitivity training - measurements during training)

M_4 (measurements immediately at end of training)

M_5 (measurements later - after training)

Diagram [I]

A SENSITIVITY TRAINING IMPACT MODEL